

P. J. SIJPESTEIJN

SEG IV 157: A CORRECTION

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 87 (1991) 255–256

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## SEG IV 157: A CORRECTION

This metrical funeral inscription, found at Sutrium (about 50 km to the north of Rome) and dated to the 1st century B.C. or A.D., was originally published by A.Vogliano, *Not.Scavi* 1925,373f. It was republished with supplements for the missing right part by W.Crönert and A.Wilhelm as SEG IV 157. W.Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I*, Berlin 1955 printed this text as no.2045 with Vogliano's supplements for lines 3 and 4, Wilhelm's supplements for lines 5 and 6 and proposed himself a supplement for the lacuna at the end of line 2. In Peek's book the inscription under discussion is published as follows:

cḥν - - - -  
 οὐ γὰρ ἔην κείνος θνητὸς νέ[ος, ἀλλ' ἐκορᾶσθαι]  
 οἶόν φασιν Ἔρωτα ἐν ἄνθεσιν ε[ἰαρινοῖσιν]  
 4 παίζειν ἐν λέκτροισι νέης χρ[υσεῖς Ἀφροδίτης].  
 τοῖος ἔην Πήγασος ἐμὸς παῖ[ς· νῦν δὲ τεθνηκὼς]  
 [π]ᾶσιν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν κλέος [μεγαλόνυμον ἔξει].

In her book ΠΑΙΔΕC ΑΩΠΟΙ. Poésie funéraire I, Athens 1978, A.M.Vérlil hac reprints the above inscription once more as no.46 and gives a photograph of the stone (plate 9).<sup>1</sup>

Regarding Vogliano's supplement at the end of line 3 Madame Vérlil hac remarks: "à la fin du vers 3 il semble qu'on ait plutôt un H, on voit en effet une haste verticale portant un seul trait horizontal, au milieu, et la pierre ne paraît pas usée." However, she does not draw the conclusion of her quite correct remarks. There can be no doubt about the last letter visible at the end of line 3: it is an eta and we should read and supplement ἡ[αρινοῖσιν].<sup>2</sup>

My correction regards, however, the reading and supplement of line 4.<sup>3</sup> It is perhaps not astonishing that M.Vérlil hac printed in line 4 λέκτροισιν, since in line 6 the stone has ἀνθρώποισιν<sup>4</sup> and the till now accepted supplement at the end of line 3 has been

<sup>1</sup> M.Vérlil hac prints in line 1 (not necessarily the first line of the poem) only Ζ; she does not print Peek's supplement for the end of line 2 (rightly so in my opinion. I think that the supplement of the end of this line has to take into account the supplement to be made at the end of line 4); she reads in line 4 λέκτροισιν νέης (but she wrongly doubles the single ny on the stone); she puts a dot underneath the rho of χρ[υσεῖς in the same line; she prints πᾶσιν instead of Peek's [π]ᾶσιν.

<sup>2</sup> The adjective ἡαρινός is only seldom attested. It occurs in h.Cer.401: ὁππότε δ' ἄνθεσι γαῖ' εὐώδε[σιν] ἡαρινο[ῖσιν]. Cf. N.J.Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford 1974, note ad locum.

<sup>3</sup> M.Vérlil hac expresses her doubts about the supplements at the ends of lines 3, 5 and 6 by putting a question mark after these supplements. In line 4, however, a question mark is missing after χρ[υσεῖς Ἀφροδίτης].

<sup>4</sup> By cutting ἀνθρώποισιν the stone-cutter (?; or was this reading already on the example he copied ?) makes a short syllable wrongly long by position. This mistake may have been occasioned by perseveratio. Also in line 4 a sin against metrics is committed. The alpha of Πήγασος is short by nature but -γα- is taken as a long syllable in this line. However, since we are dealing with a proper name, this can be understood and forgiven.

ε[ἰαρινοῖαι].<sup>5</sup> I, therefore, believe that also in line 4 we have to read λέκτροαι. The next word then starts with E. Turning now to the plate of the stone it will be obvious to everyone that χρ (even with a dot underneath the rho) is an impossible reading for the last two letters visible in this line. The last but one letter is without a shade of doubt a N and the last one in all probability an E. At the end of this line we, therefore, need a supplement that has to fulfill the following metrical scheme: U | - U U | - x.<sup>6</sup>

Naturally only *exempli gratia* one could give the following readings and supplements for lines 3 and 4:

οἶόν φααι Ἔρωτα ἐν ἄνθεαι ἡ[αρινοῖαι]  
παίζειν ἐν λέκτροαι ἐῆς νε[οθηλέος ἄγρης]<sup>7</sup>

" --- such as they say that Eros amidst spring flowers plays in the bed of his fresh prey ---"

I do not know whether the point of resemblance between Eros and Pegasus whom this stone memorises was beauty (so M.Vérilhac, *op.cit.* II, Athens 1982,40f.) or the total absence of sorrows.

It should be noted that both Eros and the mythological horse Pegasus were winged.

I must confess that I cannot find in this inscription a hook to hang on the assumption that the deceased Pegasus was an ἄωρος παῖς.<sup>8</sup>

University of Amsterdam

P.J.Sijpesteijn

<sup>5</sup> φααι and ἄνθεαι in line 3 and πααι in line 6 naturally have a ny ephelkystikon to avoid hiatus. Hiatus is not avoided in line 3: Ἔρωτα ἐν.

<sup>6</sup> A metrical scheme U | - - | - x giving a versus spondiacus is possible but less likely.

<sup>7</sup> R.Merkelbach proposes to supplement at the end of line 4 *exempli gratia* νε[U - U U μητρόος or νε[U -U τεκούσης.

<sup>8</sup> A parent could naturally always call a child παῖς regardless of the age of the child. παῖς in the inscription under discussion does not necessarily mean a child between 7 and 14 years of age (cf. Hippocr., *De Septemm.* 5 = VIII. 636-637 Littré).